



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/579,370	05/26/2000	David Friedman	BUFFALO 201	7613
10037	7590	12/08/2005	EXAMINER	
MILDE & HOFFBERG, LLP 10 BANK STREET SUITE 460 WHITE PLAINS, NY 10606			HOM, SHICK C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2666	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/579,370	FRIEDMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Shick C. Hom	<b>Art Unit</b> 2666	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/24/04 & 9/12/05.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-14 and 16-24 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-9,11-14 and 16-24 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                         |                                                                             |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                                |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|                                                                                                                         | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/24/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument in page 13 regarding claim 1, that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the digital data communications channel being the Internet connection having a state independent of the request) is not clearly recited in the rejected claim 1.

Further, applicant argued that the server of Petty et al. is not responsive to both a set of user preferences and the state is not persuasive because Col. 9 lines 7-33 which recite the connection being established with the user including the implementation of preferences and col. 2 lines 36-41 which recite the apparatus permitting voice communications via the Internet being independent of user location, e.g. state of connections, clearly reads on the server being responsive to both a set of user preferences and the state of the channel.

In response to applicant's argument in the next to last paragraph of page 13 and the first paragraph of page 14, that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's

Art Unit: 2666

invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., communication commencing with a request from the server to the user and opening a VoIP communication between the user with a live agent whereby the live agent being provided with access to the user related data and status of the communication session between the browser and the server, respectively) are not recited in the rejected claims 6 and 11, respective. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In the last paragraph of page 13 of the Remarks, applicant argued that Petty did not teach or suggest establishing the economic interest of a party distinct from the user being material to the establishment of the voice communication is not persuasive because Petty in col. 6 line 55 to col. 7 line which recite using the billing server for tracking the PSTN usage and log distance charges and preparing call detail records for the ISP which uses the call detail record to prepare bills for its service subscribers clearly anticipate means for establishing the economic interest of a party distinct from the user being material to the establishment of the voice communication. Further, applicant argued that Petty did not teach the

Art Unit: 2666

limitation of claim 5 is not persuasive because claim 5 has been cancelled.

In page 14 of the Remarks, applicant argued that Petty does not disclose a direct communication between the application program and the telephony hardware nor an API call to an external program is not persuasive, while examiner agrees that Petty does not specifically recite a direct communication between the application program and the telephony hardware nor an API call to an external program, Petty in the abstract which recites a computer telephony server controlling telephony hardware for providing voice over Internet voice communication including the use of a Web server clearly read on the direct communication between the application program and the telephony hardware and the API call to an external program whereby the application program is the software in the computer telephony server and the interface to the Web server is the API call to an external program as recited in claim 17. /

In pages 14-15 of the Remarks, applicant argued that Smith, III is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2666

See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Smith, III is pertinent to the particular problem of facilitating access to information over the computer network such as the Internet. Further applicant argued that Smith III merely recite use of the Microsoft Window Explorer and not the use of the Microsoft Windows operating system is not persuasive because col. 6 lines 17-23 recite the use of any major computer operating systems which clearly anticipate the Microsoft Windows operating system.

### ***Specification***

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Art Unit: 2666

3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1 line 5, the words "a user" seem to refer back to the "user" recited in claim 1 line 2. If this is true, it is suggested changing "a user" to ---the user---. In claim 2 line 4, the word "a public" seem to refer back to the "public" recited in claim 1 line 11. If this is true, it is suggested changing "a public" to ---the public---. In claim 16 line 2, the word "a voice" seem to refer back to the "voice" recited in claim 11 line 3. If this is true, it is suggested changing "a voice" to ---the voice---. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 11-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2666

In claim 1 line 6 which recite "the user voice communication" lacks clear antecedent basis because no user voice communication have been previously recited in the claim and therefore the limitation is not clearly understood.

In claim 11 line 6 which recite the system comprising an application program is not clear as to how the application program is related to or connected in the system to cause communication between the user and the second party. Claims 2, 4, 12-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because they depend from rejected claims 1 and 11, respectively.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2666

7. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11-13, 14-17, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Petty et al. (6,337,858).

Regarding claims 1, 17:

Petty et al. disclose the internet telephony system comprising a browser display having a hyperlink (see Fig. 5 and col. 9 lines 7-33 which recite the screen display for browsing the WWW including the request for a voice connection and the hyperlink), said hyperlink communicating with a server (see col. 7 line 65 to col. 8 line 18 which recite the web server), retrieving a user's preferences (see col. 8 line 45 to col. 9 line 6 which recite the preference file for the user), and initiating a voice communication with the user, through a communications channel defined by the user preferences (see col. 10 lines 8-65 which recite the connection medium preference). Further, Petty et al. disclose the telephony server (see col. 7 line 65 to col. 8 line 18 which recite voice communication using a web server), comprising an application program communicating directly with telephony hardware to implement telephony system control (see abstract which recite the use of computer controlled telephony hardware for voice communication and col. 6 line 55 to col. 7 line 16 which recite the software and hardware for originating voice calls from a data network clearly reads on

Art Unit: 2666

the application program), and an application programming interface, wherein said application program includes as one of its application programming interface functions a call to an external program (see col. 7 lines 54-61 which recite the web interface for ISP and subscriber administration functions clearly reads on an application programming interface including call to external program).

Regarding claim 6:

Petty et al. disclose the Internet telephony system comprising a client system having an Internet browser (see Fig. 5 and col. 9 lines 7-33 which recite the screen display for browsing the WWW including the request for a voice connection, the hyperlink, and the client), and a server hosting a Web site (see col. 7 line 65 to col. 8 line 18 which recite the web server), wherein a message is transmitted from the server to the client system based on the user's status with respect to Web site, the seeking to establish a voice communication session (see col. 10 lines 8-65 which recite the web server sending a preference form to the client requesting the information when the client requested a VoIP call connection).

Regarding claim 11:

Petty et al. disclose the Internet telephone system (see col. 6 lines 10-29 which recite the Internet including telephone

Art Unit: 2666

network), comprising a browser display having a hyperlink (see Fig. 5 and col. 9 lines 7-33 which recite the screen display for browsing the WWW including the request for a voice connection and the hyperlink), said hyperlink communicating with a server (see col. 7 line 65 to col. 8 line 18 which recite the web server), retrieving a user-related data (see col. 8 line 45 to col. 9 line 6 which recite the preference file for the user), and initiating a voice communication with the user (see col. 10 lines 8-65 which recite the web server sending a preference form to the client requesting the information when the client requested a VoIP call connection).

Regarding claims 2, 7:

Petty et al. disclose wherein said digital data communications channel carries data between a user terminal and a web server, the web server communicating with a distinct server for establishing the user voice communication channel involving a PSTN (see abstract and col. 5 line 54 to col. 6 line 9 which recite the voice communications may be voice over Internet or PSTN voice connections).

Regarding claims 8, 14:

Petty et al. disclose wherein the user's preferences are retrieved in a cookie (see col. 8 line 45 to col. 9 line 6 which recite the preference file for the user including a cookie).

Art Unit: 2666

Regarding claims 4, 9, 12, 13, 16, 22-24:

Petty et al. disclose wherein the user interactively communicates through the digital data communications channel to establish the state, and the server establishing the voice communication being further responsive to an economic interest of a party distinct from the user; wherein the application program interfaces with a monetary account system; a micropayment system; and wherein the application program supports an application service provider payment model (see col. 6 line 55 to col. 7 line which recite using the billing server for tracking the PSTN usage and log distance charges and preparing call detail records for the ISP which uses the call detail record to prepare bills for its service subscribers).

Regarding claim 21:

Petty et al. disclose a communications link to a Web server, for coordinating telephony functions and Web server functions (see col. 6 lines 44-54 which recite the Web server for telephony functions).

Regarding claim 19:

Petty et al. disclose wherein the application program may spawn a plurality of instances of the external program simultaneously (see Fig. 9A which shows the spawning of a plurality of external program simultaneously).

Art Unit: 2666

Regarding claim 20:

Petty et al. disclose wherein the application program has a component running on a telephony server and a component running on each telephony client (see Fig. 2 and col. 6 line 55 to col. 7 line 17 which shows the software running in the server and client).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in

Art Unit: 2666

order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petty et al. (6,337,858) in view of Smith, III (6,772,139).

Regarding claim 18:

For claim 18, Petty et al. disclose the telephony system and server described in paragraph 7 of this office action. For claims 18-20, Petty et al. disclose all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of wherein the application program is a dynamic link library adapted to run under Microsoft Windows as in claim 18.

Smith, III from the same or similar fields of endeavor teach that it is known to provide wherein the application program is a dynamic link library adapted to run under Microsoft Windows (see col. 9 lines 13-28). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide wherein the application program is a dynamic link library adapted to run under Microsoft Windows as taught by Smith, III in the telephony system and server of Petty et al. The application program being a dynamic link library adapted to run under Microsoft Windows can be

Art Unit: 2666

implemented by providing the Microsoft Windows operating system software in the browser software of Petty et al. The motivation for providing the application program being a dynamic link library adapted to run under Microsoft Windows as taught by Smith III in the system and device of Petty et al. being that it provides more efficiency for the system since the system is using the well know Microsoft Windows operating system for operation efficiency of the system.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

11. Claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action

Art Unit: 2666

is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shick C. Hom whose telephone number is 571-272-3173. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2666

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SH



DANG TON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER